### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Sandbridge Technologies, Inc. Conf. No.: 3524

Serial No.: 10/617,188 Art Unit: 1755

Filed: July 10, 2003 Examiner:

For: DOPPLER COMPENSATED RECEIVER

### SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN OPINION

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith is a written opinion performed by the U.S. Receiving Office in corresponding PCT application No. PCT/US04/021656. You will note that the claims are novel. have inventive step and industrial application. Thus the passage of the U.S. case is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Barnes & Thomburg, Deposit Account No. 02-1010 (29083/40711).

Respectfully submitted,

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP

Perry Palan

Reg. No. 26,213

### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To: PERRY PA BARNES & 750 17TH S SUITE 900 WASHING	& THORN STREET,	BURG LL N.W.		LUMINANO AO MONITT	PCT  WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY  (PCT Rule 66)				
					Date of mailing (day/month/year)	14 AUG 2006			
Applicant's or agent's file reference					REPLY DUE				
29083/4245					within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing				
International application No.				International filing date (	ay/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year)				
PCT/US04/21656				07 July 2004 (07.07.2004	4) 10 July 2003 (10.07.2003)				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  IPC: Please See Continuation Sheet  USPC: 373/346									
Applicant									
SANDBRIDGE TECHNOLOGIES, INC									
1.	_ ×	The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:  is is not is not							
2. Th	considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.								
2. 11	This second (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:								
	=	Box No. I Basis of the opinion							
_	=	x No. II Priority							
<u> </u>	=	x No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability							
Ļ	Box	No. IV Lack of unity of invention							
2	∐ Box	No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement							
_	Box	No. VI							
L	Box	No. VII Certain defects in the international application							
	Box	No. VIII	III Certain observations on the international application						
3. Th	3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.								
When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e).									
How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.									
Also For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis.  For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.  For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.									
If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.									
<ol> <li>The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 10 November 2005 (10.11.2005)</li> </ol>									
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Amr. IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (511) 273-3201					Authorized officer / Yed Wang / Wylenia Joyan Telephone No. (571) 22-3053				

Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201 Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(April 2005)

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US04/21656

1. Statement  Novelty (N)  Claims 1-25  Claims NONE  Inventive Step (IS)  Claims 1-25  Claims NONE  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-25  Claims NONE  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-25  Claims NONE  2. Citations and Explanations:  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensates for a Doppler increased frequency by decreasing a cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples are cited in independent claim 1 and claim 17, respectively.  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter of the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples are cited in independent claim 1 and claim 17, respectively.  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter of the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensate for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples are cited in independent claim 1 and claim 17, respectively.  NEW CITATIONS  NEW CITATIONS	у́п
Claims NONE  Inventive Step (IS)  Claims 1-25  Claims NONE  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-25  Claims NONE  2. Citations and Explanations:  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensates for a Doppler increased frequency by increasing a cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples are cited in independent claim! and claim! T, respectively.  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter c be made or used in industry.	NO YES NO YES NO
Inventive Step (IS)  Claims 1-25  Claims NONE  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-25  Claims NONE  Claims NONE  2. Citations and Explanations:  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensates for a Doppler increased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples "are teiced in independent claim!" and claim! Are repetitively.  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter c be made or used in industry.	YES NO YES NO
Claims NONE  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1_25  Claims NONE  2. Citations and Explanations:  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensates for a Doppler increased frequency by decreasing a cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples are cited in independent claim 1 and claim 17, respectively.  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter of be made or used in industry.	NO YES NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-25  Claims NONE  Claims 1-25  Claims 1-25  Claims 1-25  Claims 1-25  Claims 1-25  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensates for a Doppler increased frequency by decreasing a cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples are full in independent claim! and claim! 7, respectively.  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter c be made or used in industry.	YES NO
Claims NONE  2. Citations and Explanations:  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensates for a Doppler increased frequency by decreasing a cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples are cited in independent claim! and claim! 7, respectively.  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter c be made or used in industry.	NO No
Claims NONE  2. Citations and Explanations:  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensates for a Doppler increased frequency by decreasing a cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples are cited in independent claim! and claim! T, respectively.  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter c be made or used in industry.	yn yn
Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest "prior to demodulation, compensates for a Doppler increased frequency by decreasing a cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples' are retired in independent claim 1 and claim 17, respectively.  Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter of be made or used in industry.	у́п
demodulation, compensates for a Doppler increased frequency by decreasing a cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples and compensates for a Doppler decreased frequency by increasing the cycle of m samples by one sample period eve samples" as recited in independent claim 1 and claim 17, respectively. Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter c be made or used in industry.	у́п
NEW CITATIONS	

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US04/21656

Supp	lemental	Box
------	----------	-----

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.)

#### TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Report on Patentability (Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treatly).

Continuation of IPC: H03D 1704 (2006.01),1706 (2006.01) H03K 5701 (2006.01),6704 (2006.01);H04B 1/10 (2006.01);H04L 1/00 (2006.01),25/08 (2006.01)